

Members

Sen. Sue Landske, Chairperson  
Sen. Becky Skillman  
Sen. Billie Breaux  
Sen. Allie Craycraft  
Rep. Duane Cheney  
Rep. Thomas Kromkowski  
Rep. Robert Behning  
Rep. Kathy Richardson



## CENSUS DATA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Legislative Services Agency*  
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789  
Tel: (317) 233-0696 Fax: (317) 232-2554

LSA Staff:

Robert Rudolph, Attorney for the Committee  
Chris Baker, Fiscal Analyst for the Committee

Authority: IC 2-5-19

### MEETING MINUTES<sup>1</sup>

Meeting Date: August 28, 2001  
Meeting Time: 10:00 A.M.  
Meeting Place: State House, 200 W. Washington  
St., Room 233  
Meeting City: Indianapolis, Indiana  
Meeting Number: 1

**Members Present:** Sen. Sue Landske, Chairperson; Sen. Billie Breaux; Sen. Allie Craycraft; Rep. Thomas Kromkowski; Rep. Robert Behning; Rep. Kathy Richardson.

**Members Absent:** Sen. Becky Skillman; Rep. Duane Cheney.

(1) Call to Order. The Chair, Senator Landske, called the meeting to order at approximately 10:10 a.m.

(2) Introduction of Members. Each of the committee members present and staff introduced themselves.

(3) Redistricting Technical Corrections. The Chair recognized Maureen Bard and Mark Stratton to explain proposed technical corrections to the legislative redistricting act<sup>2</sup> from the 2001 Session.

---

1. Exhibits and other materials referenced in these minutes can be inspected and copied in the Legislative Information Center in Room 230 of the State House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Requests for copies may be mailed to the Legislative Information Center, Legislative Services Agency, 200 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2789. A fee of \$0.15 per page and mailing costs will be charged for copies. These minutes are also available on the Internet at the General Assembly homepage. The URL address of the General Assembly homepage is <http://www.ai.org/legislative/>. No fee is charged for viewing, downloading, or printing minutes from the Internet.

2. P.L.212-2001 (HEA 1776-2001).

Ms. Bard distributed map.<sup>3</sup> Using an example of precincts located in Hamilton County, Indiana, Ms. Bard explained that errors were arose in the GIS database created for the legislative and congressional redistricting when geographic data generated at different times and at different scales were overlaid. The data overlay resulted in creation of "geographic slivers" in the data base which are small polygons at the boundaries of geographic features, such as precincts. These slivers usually represent elements of geography that may be only inches wide stretched out over a substantial distance. Ms. Bard distributed an excerpt from a DICTIONARY OF GIS TERMINOLOGY<sup>4</sup> which defined the term "geographic slivers".

Ms. Bard explained that if these slivers are created at the boundary between two legislative districts, the slivers must be assigned to a particular district. In some cases, the redistricting program by default assigned these slivers, some to the wrong districts.

Staff distributed PD 3027 concerning redistricting technical corrections.<sup>5</sup> Staff explained that SECTION 1 of the draft was designed to provide a statutory rule for the assignment of slivers so that these geographic elements would be assigned to the correct districts. After additional research and discussion with the Office of Census Data, staff developed modified language which is incorporated in a document distributed to the Committee.<sup>6</sup>

Staff reviewed the remainder of the draft with the following explanation of each SECTION:

- ' SECTION 2 contains an amendment to correct a cross reference error in the general provisions of the redistricting statute.
- ' SECTIONS 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 assign Indiana geography that was unassigned or erroneously assigned in the redistricting act to the correct districts.
- ' SECTIONS 4 and 5 correct a discontiguity in the descriptions of House Districts 16 and 23.

(4) Election Law Proposals. The Chair recognized Mr. Dale Simmons, Co-General Counsel, Indiana Election Division. Staff distributed a copy of a document entitled "2001 CDAC Legislative Ideas".<sup>7</sup> Mr. Simmons reviewed each of the points contained in the

---

3. Copies of the maps are "Exhibit 1" to these Minutes. The Exhibit consists of three maps of precincts in Hamilton County, Indiana. The first map shows the southern portions of Atlanta West Precinct and Atlanta East Precinct. The second map shows a portion of the boundary between these two precincts on an extremely small scale. The third map is similar to the second and has a legend reading "Scale differences that create a split census block."

4. The ESRI Press, © 2001 Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. The excerpt is page 92 of the cited book. A copy of the excerpt and a copy of the front and back covers of the cited book are "Exhibit 2" to these Minutes.

5. A copy of PD 3027 is "Exhibit 3" to these Minutes.

6. A copy of this document is "Exhibit 4" to these Minutes.

7. A copy of this document is "Exhibit 5" to these Minutes.

document.

With respect to point #1, Mr. Simmons explained that under current Indiana law, major party candidates for President, U.S. Senator and Governor are required to obtain the signatures of 5,000 voters, with at least 500 required from each Congressional District. The question for the Committee is whether the total number of signatures should be reduced from 5,000 to 4,500 to reflect the loss of an Indiana Congressional district or whether the requirement should be maintained as is.

Mr. Simmons elaborated on point #3 by telling the Committee that replacing punch card voting systems as required by SEA 268-2001 has been estimated to cost between \$25 million and \$40 million. The amount of money appropriated for this purpose is insufficient to cover the 50% state match required under SEA 268.

With respect to the question posed under point #6, Representative Kromkowski stated that he believes that it was the legislative intent that the same standards for determining party affiliation for candidacies should apply to determining party affiliation for appointments to local boards.

The Chair recognized Laurie Christie, Co-Director of the Election Division to discuss point #7 relating to a statewide mailing to all registered voters. Ms. Christie explained that the mailing would assist in cleaning up voter registration lists.

Senator Landske asked whether this question has been discussed by the task force on election reform. Spencer Valentine, Co-Director of the Election Division responded that the subject had been discussed by the task force, but the task force has not made any recommendations. Mr. Valentine also discussed a proposal to create a class of mail for election materials that would make a statewide mailing less expensive if adopted.

Senator Craycraft asked if the voter registration files could be purged after a statewide mailing. Mr. Valentine responded that the information from such a mailing would not permit an immediate purge of the voter registration files; Mr. Valentine outlined the process required by the National Voter Registration Act ("NVRA") for removing the name of an individual from the voter registration files.

Representative Richardson asked whether a statewide mailing would permit the removal of duplicate registrations. Mr. Valentine explained that the NVRA would permit a removal of duplicate registrations only if the voter affirmatively responded to consent to the removal; however, if a voter did not respond to a mailing, the voter's duplicate registrations could be eventually removed under the NVRA. The statewide mailing would be part of that process. Mr. Valentine said that it has been estimated to cost \$1 million for a statewide mailing.

Senator Craycraft asked how long a candidate is required to keep campaign finance related information. Staff directed Senator Craycraft to IC 3-9-1-24 for an answer to his question.

The Committee directed staff to prepare a draft to incorporate the Election Division's proposal's for the Committee's review.

(5) Census Statutes Update Project. The Chair asked staff to review the interim project to update Indiana statutes to reflect changes due to the 2000 Census. Staff told the Committee that several Indiana statutes use population criteria to determine whether the statute applies to particular political subdivisions.

As an example, Staff cited IC 36-4-1-1 which classifies cities according to population. Cities that have a population of 35,000 or more are classified as "second class cities" while those with a population of less than 35,000 are classified as "third class cities". Due to amendments since 1991, a city whose population that grows above 35,000 has an option of remaining a third class city or becoming a second class city, while a second class city whose population falls below 35,000 remains a second class city or may elect to become a third class city. Staff reported that the population of the cities of Carmel, Columbus, Greenwood, and Lawrence grew above 35,000; any of these could elect to become second class cities.

Staff explained work had begun on this project by searching the Indiana Code for all references to the word "population". Nearly 700 sections of the Indiana Code contain the word "population". In the case of some Code sections, the word is used in a general sense and the statute would not be affected by the results of the 2000 Census. In other cases, the statutes use population to define a particular political subdivision or a class of political subdivisions, such as is the case with IC 36-4-1-1. Some statutes use population as a variable in determining distribution of money.

Staff suggested that it was unnecessary for the Committee to look at statutes where the word "population" in a general sense. Staff requested instruction on the extent to which the Committee wished to review the remaining statutes. Which of the remaining statutes and the amount of detail the Committee wanted to devote to those statutes would determine the amount of work that was ahead.

Staff told the Committee that because Indiana lost a Congressional seat after the 2000 Census, the Committee may want to look at another set of statutes that are affected. Indiana law requires links the number of member of some government boards and commissions and the distribution of the residence of the members to be based on Indiana's congressional districts. A reduction in the number of congressional seats may force a change in some of those statutes. Staff indicated that the number of such statutes is small by comparison to the number of statutes containing the word "population".

(6) Public Testimony. The Chair recognized Mr. Stratton to give the Committee an update of the activities of the Office of Census Data. Staff distributed copies of a letter sent from the Office to Circuit Court Clerks.<sup>8</sup> Mr. Stratton said that the letter was sent to introduce himself and Ms. Bard and to explain the function of the Office of Census Data. Mr. Stratton briefly discussed the Census Bureau procedure for updating corporate boundaries due to annexations and other changes. Mr. Stratton explained how the Office of Census Data can assist municipalities in the process.<sup>9</sup>

---

8. A copy of the letter is "Exhibit 6" to these Minutes.

9. This procedure is the Census Bureau's "Boundary and Annexation Survey".

(7) Select Next Meeting Date

The Chair set the next Committee meeting for Monday, September 17 at 10:00 a.m. The meeting room will be announced later.

(8) Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m.